

#### A. Introduction.

1. In banning the World Peace Council (WPC) from directing the activities of the World Peace Movement from headquarters in Vienna, the Austrian Ministry of Interior charged the WPC with taking a one-sided, biased attitude in the recent period towards international political events which could, if continued, give the impression that Austria supports or tolerates these activities. It appears from a "Statement by the Austrian Peace Council" published in the 1 March 1957 issue of the WPC Bulletin (still published in Vienna despite the ban) that the WPC has seized upon and interpreted in its own fashion that phrase in the dissolution order referring particularly to statements, declarations, etc., "in the recent period". The Austrian Peace Council statement interprets this as referring only to the period since 9 November 1956, a date when the statement claims, changes were made in the WPC Secretariat that bring it in line with Austrian legal requirements. It is apparent, however, that the Austrian Government intended no such narrow restriction: any reference to "recent international events" must surely be taken to include, at least, the seizure of the Suez Canal by the Egyptian Government, the subsequent armed action by England, France and Israel, and also the use of armed force by the Soviet Union against the Hungarian people. Obviously, the WPC would like to eliminate consideration of the "one-sided, biased action and attitudes" it took on these problems and events. A sufficient number of its individual members and affiliates found the position of the WPC on these recent crises intolerable enough to split the Council and immobilize many of the national affiliates. Doubt has even been expressed that the WPC can survive. (An account of WPC attitudes and action during the Suez and Hungarian crises and the subsequent revulsion and disruption caused among important affiliates will be included later in this paper. (See Attachment 4.)

2. Even this attempt to direct attention away from the important issues has a false aspect. Although the WPC had been discussing decentralization, liberalization, democratization and reorganization off and on since the edict for such changes went out from the 20th Congress of the CPSU in February 1956, the reorganization was always admittedly only contemplated and no public announcement was ever made that actual reorganization had taken place. No formal meeting of Council or Bureau that could provide a representative, democratic quorum has been announced during the time specified. The Helsinki meeting of 18 November 1956 was called for and concerned with only the "emergency" in the Middle East (until some of the members forced the meeting to take a stand on the situation in Hungary also). Many of the signatures to the resulting "resolution" were obtained from WPC members not present; the meeting was not a representative quorum. The only other meeting was in Paris (December 1956 or January 1957) of which Isabelle Blume, a chief

WPC Secretary and spokesman, said, "It will be a meeting of neither the Bureau nor the Secretariat but a conference called by President Joliot-Curie to work out practical measures in fulfilling decisions adopted in the June and November meetings." (The June meeting, incidentally, was also a mere handful of the "clique" who run the WPC, and by no means a representative quorum). So the WPC has put itself in a dilemma: either there was no reorganization as claimed, or it must renounce its claims to be a democratic, autonomous body following definite parliamentary procedures, since no formal meeting occurred, and, with the present dissension in the ranks, could scarcely have agreed upon reorganization plans. Even if a hurried "paper" reorganization took place, the same people are still carrying on in the same way. It may be further noted that even the contemplated reorganization, as announced by the WPC, follows closely changes in the organization and policies of the Soviet Union. (Note: For the purposes of the legal suit, any reorganization at a Bureau meeting announced to take place in March 1957 in Berlin cannot be considered, since it will occur after the expulsion order.) For further information on organization, see Section C.

3. The propaganda and activities of the WPC during the last year and up to its latest pronouncements have not changed, except to conform to changes in tone and in line of the Soviet pattern, as is shown from parallel "lines" taken from official WPC sources. (See Section B). This, it may be remarked, was despite the admission of WPC members themselves, at the plenary WPC Conference in Stockholm in April 1956, that there must be a change in methods and language if the Peace Movement were to survive. (Of. speeches of Isabelle Blum, Corona; article by Pierre Cot in the WPC monthly organ, Horizons.)

4. It will be recalled that the WPC established its headquarters in Vienna against the wishes and without the permission of the Austrian authorities. After having been expelled from Paris in 1951 for subversive activities, the WPC had tried futilely to find another location in the West (its target), and spent a brief period in Prague. It was able to get into Vienna under the protection of the Soviet occupation. It was reliably reported that the Vienna Government refused to grant visas for the first international meeting of the WPC after the end of the occupation. This meeting took place in October 1955 and only three of the WPC announced list of fourteen foreign delegates were present: these three (Ilya Khrenburg was one) were able to enter on diplomatic passports. It was believed that the moderate reaction of the Vienna Communist press to this was perhaps because the front organizations feared that violent press attacks might force the Austrian Ministry of Interior to publish the unsavory records of the persons to whom visas had been refused.

5. Communist front organizations form an entity, of which the WPC is an important part, as is shown by the interlocking directorates and joint advertising and sponsoring of events of the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Federation of Democratic Women, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the International Students Union, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Organization of Journalists, and the Committee for the Promotion of International Trade. The last-named front was recently dissolved, but it had been created at the WPC-sponsored Moscow Economic Conference. (See Attachment 2)

6. The overwhelming preponderance of Communists on the WPC and its national affiliates preclude any possibility of its being other than biased and one-sided. [REDACTED]

25X1A6c